UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

l	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
•	10/521,841	07/27/2005	Robert Wieder	601-1-134PCTUS	1291
	23565 KLAUBER & .	7590 02/28/2007 IACKSON		EXAMINER	
411 HACKENSACK AVENUE HACKENSACK, NJ 07601			NATARAJAN, MEERA		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1609	
_					
	SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
	31 D	DAYS	02/28/2007	PAF	PER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/521,841	WIEDER, ROBERT			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit.			
	Meera Natarajan Ph.D.	1609			
The MAILING DATE of this communication		the correspondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatic - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report. Decided will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. Only be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2005.				
·= · · _ ·	•				
3) Since this application is in condition for all	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims		•			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,7-13, 47 and 49-54</u> is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5, 7-13, 47 and 49-54</u> are subjected subjected to.	hdrawn from consideration.	requirement			
Application Papers		, oquii omom.			
· ·	miner				
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· 4) Interview Su	mmary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	8) Paper No(s)/	Mail Dateomal Patent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/521,841 Page 2

Art Unit: 1609

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-5 and 7-11, drawn to a method for disrupting survival signaling from the microenvironment to cancer cells.

Group II, claim(s) 12, 13, 47, 49-54, drawn to a method of inhibiting cellular proliferation or inducing cell death or cellular differentiation or for treating a cancer or a hyperproliferative disorders in a mammal.

Group III, claim(s) 55-59, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under r PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature.

To have a general inventive concept under PCT rule 13.1, the inventions need to be linked by a special technical feature. The common feature recited in claim 1 is a method for disrupting survival signaling from the microenvironment to cancer cells by effectively blocking the interaction of an integrin with an extracellular matrix protein or downregulating expression of said integrin. In view of this Bates et al. (Cancer Metastasis Rev. 1995 Sep;14(3):191-203) reads on the claim. Bates et al. teaches the involvement of integrins in cell survival and that apoptosis can be induced

Application/Control Number: 10/521,841

Art Unit: 1609

Page 3

experimentally by blocking integrin binding to specific components of the extracellular matrix. Therefore the technical feature recited in claim 1 is not special. Accordingly the groups are not so linked as to form a single general concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

3. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in response to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

If any Group is elected, applicant must elect one species from the following groups.

Integrin: (claims 3,13, 50, 53, 55, 59)

- 1) alpha 5
- 2) beta 1

cancer cell: (claims 4 & 49)

- 3) breast
- 4) prostate

agent: (claims 5-8, 56)

- 5) antibody specific for an integrin
- 6) blocking peptide
- 7) modified peptide
- 8) all trans retinoic acid

Application/Control Number: 10/521,841 Page 4

Art Unit: 1609

9) retinoic acid derivative

- 10) kinase inhibitor
- 11) transcription inhibitor

If applicant elects number 10) kinase inhibitor from the agent species list above, applicant must further elect a kinase inhibitor.

kinase inhibitor: (claims 11, 52, & 58)

- 19) LY294002
- 20) UO 126
- 21) AG82
- 22) Y27632
- 23) SB203580
- 24) PD169316
- 25) PD98059
- 26) RO318220
- 27) C3 transferase inhibitor

If Group I or II is elected a further "inhibitor administration" species must be elected.

inhibitor administration: (claims 47, 53 &59)

- 28) prior to a chemotherapeutic agent or radiation therapy
- 29) concurrent with a chemotherapeutic agent or radiation therapy
- 4. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply

Art Unit: 1609

must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic: 1, 5, 9, and 12.

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

Art Unit: 1609

§ 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1609

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meera Natarajan Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-270-3058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:30AM-6:00PM, ALT. Friday. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mary Mosher can be reached on 571-272-0906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MN

ZACHARIAH LUCAS PATENT EXAMINER